Remarks

Upon entry of the instant amendment, claims 1, 6 and 7 are pending. All three of these claims have been amended to more particularly point out the Applicants' invention. Since the action is under final, a Request for Continuing Examination (RCE) pursuant to 37 CFR 1.14 is enclosed. It is respectfully submitted that upon consideration of the amendment and the remarks below, the application is in condition for allowance.

Claim Objections

Claim 6 has been objected to because of an informality relating to the phrase "wireless received". It is respectfully submitted that claim 6 has been amended to overcome this objection. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. 112

Claims 1, 6 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph for containing subject matter allegedly not described in the specification. With respect to claim 1, the objectionable language relating to the plurality of application programs in the absence of a network connection has been removed. Claim 6 was rejected because of the reference to "a selected application program". Claim 6 has been amended to delete the reference to a selected application. Claim 7 has also been corrected. As such, the objections to claim 7 should be obviated. Based on the above, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the objection of claims 1, 6 and 7 with respect to 35 U.S.C. §112.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1, 6 and 7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by *McCain et al.* U.S. Patent No. 5,309,351. In order for there to be anticipation, each and every one of the elements of the claims must be found in a single reference. It is respectfully submitted that the claims as amended recite elements not disclosed or suggested by *McCain*. For example, the claims now recite a direct connection between the remote interface device and a remote host

Attorney Docket No. 11465/491

computer. A remote device as disclosed in the McCain et al. patent require interfacing by way

of a wireless interface device as well as a network interface. The Examiner's attention is

respectfully directed to FIG. 3 of the McCain et al. patent. As shown, each of the hand-held

units 60 and 61 is interfaced to the host computer 50 through an infrared interface unit 58, 59, a

satellite 55 as well as a network interface device 51. Although the satellite 55 and network

interface devices 51, 52 and 56 are not adequately described in the McCain et al. patent, McCain

et al. teaches away from a system in which the remote devices (i.e. hand-held unit 60 and 61) are

directly interfaced with the host computer 50. Indeed, the McCain et al. patent teaches away

from such a configuration. Rather than interfacing directly with a remote host computer, the

McCain et al. patent teaches interfacing through an access point in a computer network. The

Examiner's attention is directed to column 3 of the McCain et al. patent, lines 40-47 repeated

herein below:

"The satellite can control the network activity using a polled technique or respond to an interrupt transmission. The satellite

also provides interfaces to other wired networks through the use of network interface circuits adapted to the specific network protocol,

for example Enet or MAP. This allows transfer of data from a

nodal device to a computer resident on a wired network."

The present invention on the other hand, allows communication directly with a remote

host computer irrespective of whether the remote host computer is configured in a network or

contains a network interface of any kind. Thus, with the system recited in the claims at issue,

multiple hand-held units could establish communication links with different remote host

computers on a network unlike the system taught by the McCain et al. patent. For all of the

above reasons, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections

of claims 1, 6 and 7.

Respectfully submitted,

John S. Paniaguas

Registration No. 31,051

Date: January 22, 2003

4

Attorney Docket No. 11465/491

Katten Muchin Zavis Rosenman 525 West Monroe Street Suite 1600 Chicago, Illinois 60661-3693

Tel: (312) 902-5200 Fax: (312) 902-1061